

Section 8 Evaluation and Modification of the Framework

This section governs the evaluation and modification of the *Accreditation Framework*.

A. Evaluation of the Accreditation Framework

- ~~1. **Evaluation Design.** The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation are jointly responsible, in consultation with the educational institutions and organizations, for the design of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and their implementation, and for the selection of an independent evaluator to conduct the evaluation.~~
- ~~2. **Formative and Summative Evaluation.** The evaluation design will include formative components to produce early and ongoing information and suggestions about the *Accreditation Framework* and its implementation. The design will also include summative components. The evaluation will include appropriate sample of institutions and accreditation options, and will be based on comprehensive information collected over a period of time that assures that the major features of the accreditation process have been well tested. It is expected that the formative and summative evaluation will be conducted over a four-year time span, beginning when the first institution is reviewed in accordance with this Framework.~~
1. **Evaluation of Accreditation System.** *The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation are jointly responsible, in consultation with the educational institutions and organizations, for establishing, maintaining, and continually refining a system of on-going evaluation of the accreditation system for educator preparation.*
3. **2. Evaluation Report and Recommendations.** *A comprehensive evaluation and report and recommendations will be presented to the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation for their consideration. Among other policy issues, the evaluator will recommend whether Option 3 (General Program Standards) should serve, in addition to Option 1 (California Program Standards), as a basis for determining the comparability of standards under Options 2 or 5. The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation shall implement a process of continual evaluation and improvement to its accreditation system that includes, but is not limited to, the following:*

Survey Data:

The development and distribution of a survey instrument at least biennially that seeks feedback from a broad spectrum of stakeholders including Commissioners, COA members, BIR

members, higher education administrators and faculty, K-12 administrators and faculty, those involved in induction programs, major educational organizations and state agencies and public officials involved in educational policy, about the efficacy of the Commission's accreditation policies, processes, and procedures.

A summary and analysis of the survey data would be provided to the Committee on Accreditation and shared with the above stakeholders.

The Committee on Accreditation will include the information in a report to the Commission. This information may be included in the annual report to the Commission or in a subsequent report to the Commission. Pursuant to Education Code Section 44373, and as consistent with Section 8, Part B of the Framework, the Committee may include recommendations to the Commission for its consideration.

Other means of evaluation

The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation may develop other vehicles for the purpose of collecting information about the efficacy of its accreditation policies and procedures. These might include focus groups, public forums, complaints received by the Commission, survey data collected by the Commission from new teachers issued initial credentials, an evaluation conducted by independent research organizations, and other means. The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation will involve the above mentioned stakeholders in discussions about the appropriate use of these vehicles in evaluating the efficacy of the accreditation system. Should the Commission employ these vehicles, an analysis of the data would be included in the report from COA in accordance with the same general procedure as that used for survey data above.

B. Modification of the Accreditation Framework

1. **General Provisions Regarding Modifications.** The Commission will consult with the Committee on Accreditation and educational institutions and organizations regarding any proposed modifications of the Framework. Modifications will occur in public meetings of the Commission, after the Commission has considered relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, postsecondary institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission's professional staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission will determine the date when a policy modification is effective.

2. **Refinements and Clarifications of the Framework.** The Commission may modify the *Accreditation Framework* to refine or clarify its contents, as needed. The Commission retains the authority to reconsider and modify the Program Standards for Options 1, 4, 5 as the need arises.
3. **Significant Major Modifications of the Framework.** The Commission will maintain without significant modifications the *Framework's* major features and options, including the Common Standards, and Option 3 (General Program Standards), until summative evaluation is completed or until there is compelling evidence that a significant modification is warranted. The determination of compelling evidence and the warranted significant modification will be made by the Commission with the concurrence of the Committee on Accreditation and the Chancellor of the California State University, the President of the University of California, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.— Should the Commission determine that consideration of major modification of the *Framework* is warranted, it shall consider the establishment of a work group comprised of stakeholders to examine issues and to provide advice to the Committee on Accreditation and to the Commission. In doing so, the Commission may, but is not obligated, to provide financial resources to support this effort. If the Commission decides not to establish a work group, it will, nevertheless, comply with Section 8, B (1) through other means.